

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
CHARLESTON DIVISION**

Dorsey Hayden Smith,)	Civil Action No. 2:21-3989-RMG
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	
)	
Patrick Britton-Harr, G. Elsworth Harris V,)	
Coastal Laboratories, Inc., AMS Onsite,)	ORDER AND OPINION
Inc., <i>Both Individually and as Liquidating</i>)	
<i>Shareholders of any lapsed above named</i>)	
<i>entities,</i>)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

This matter is before the Court on Defendants’ motion to compel discovery. (Dkt. No. 74). Plaintiff asserts that it has fully complied with Defendants’ discovery requests. (Dkt. No. 76, 80). Defendants assert that Plaintiff’s responses are incomplete and that the late disclosures of Plaintiff create the necessity for follow-up discovery. (Dkt. No. 79).

The Court at this point does not have sufficient information from Defendants to identify the allegedly missing discovery. Therefore, the Court directs Defendants, to the extent they continue to assert that Plaintiff’s discovery responses are incomplete, to submit to Plaintiff a new set of discovery requests within 15 days of this Order that specifically identify the responses of Plaintiff which are incomplete. Defendants may also submit additional discovery requests based upon obtaining Plaintiff’s delayed discovery responses. Plaintiff is directed to submit complete responses to these additional discovery requests within 15 days of receipt. Defendants may thereafter make a new motion to compel, which specifically identifies alleged deficiencies in Plaintiff’s responses, should they determine that Plaintiff’s responses are not complete. If

Defendants determine that they need to reopen discovery beyond what is authorized in this Order, they may petition the Court for an amended scheduling order.

Based on the rulings set forth above, Defendants' motion to compel (Dkt. No. 74) is now denied as moot.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Richard M. Gergel
Richard M. Gergel
United States District Judge

April 21, 2023
Charleston, South Carolina